Report from the Airplane Performance Harmonization Working Group

1 – Statement of Task

When the first step (Task 1) is completed, explore the feasibility of harmonization of each identified difference in the order of priority: Performance Class A, Class B and Class C.

2 – Action taken

The HWG considered the differences between the FAR and JAR standards in the context of the HWG Terms of Reference (TOR) (i.e. application of the two standards may result in different load capabilities for identical airplanes under the same conditions). The relative safety levels of the standards were also considered.

3 – Results

The HWG accepted all of the requirements of FAR 121 Subpart I, FAR 135 Subpart I and JAR-OPS 1 Subparts F through I as candidates for harmonization except the following:

- <u>Class B airplane operating requirements</u> these requirements apply to propeller
 driven airplanes with a capacity of less than nine passengers. These airplane types are
 not operated by U.S. and European operators in direct competition. Since the
 underlying reason for harmonization, as defined in the TOR, is not met and no safety
 issue was identified with the current standards for these airplanes, harmonization is
 not recommended.
- <u>Class C airplane operating requirements</u> these requirements apply to reciprocatingengine powered airplanes with a capacity of more than nine passengers. These airplane types are not operated by U.S. and European operators in direct competition. Since the underlying reason for harmonization, as defined in the TOR, is not met and no safety issue was identified with the current standards for these airplanes, harmonization is not recommended.
- Short landing operations JAR-OPS 1 allows an operator to receive special approval to base the limiting landing weight on a 50 ft crossing height over a runway safety area prior to reaching the runway threshold. This relief was introduced into the JAR to accommodate existing commuter operations into extremely short runways. These airplane types are not operated by U.S. and European operators in direct competition. Since the underlying reason for harmonization, as defined in the TOR, is not met and no safety issue was identified with the current standards for these airplanes, harmonization is not recommended.

PERF HWG Task 2 Report

• <u>Steep approach operations</u> – JAR-OPS 1 allows an operator to receive special approval to base the limiting landing weight on a steep approach angle greater than or equal to 4.5 degrees. This relief was introduced into the JAR to accommodate existing commuter operations into extremely short runways. These airplane types are not operated by U.S. and European operators in direct competition. Since the underlying reason for harmonization, as defined in the TOR, is not met and no safety issue was identified with the current standards for these airplanes, harmonization is not recommended.